

REMARKS

Claims 1-32 were originally submitted.

Claims 33-40 were previously added.

Claims 1 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,226,752 to Gupta et al (Gupta).

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gupta.

Claims 3-6 and 8-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gupta in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,774,551 to Wu et al (Wu).

Claims 1-40 remain in this application.

35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,226,752 to Gupta et al (Gupta). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of the claims.

Independent claim 1 recites in part "expiring cookies from the browser in accordance with the request, wherein the cookies include data provided to the browser by the server".

Gupta fails to teach or suggest the method of claim 1. Gupta describes "[a] method and apparatus for authenticating users" (i.e., clients), where "[o]ne or more embodiments of the invention may utilize cookies to aid in the authentication process". See abstract of Gupta.

Browsers may send (forward) requests and any associated cookies to the application server. Gupta, col. 11 lines 46-48. "To locate a session, the cookie that is forwarded from the browser may be examined and compared to sessions

1 currently active. If no cookie is forwarded from the browser, the session is not
2 valid". Gupta, col. 11 line 66 to col. 12 line 6.

3 A user may issue a logout request to the server by entering a logout URL at
4 the browser or clicking a link on the browser. To effectuate the logout, the
5 browser may send the request to the server (i.e., application server and login
6 server), and forward the associated cookie with the request. Gupta col. 13 lines
7 45-51. The cookie identifies the user that is requesting the logout. "Without the
8 cookie, the server may not know who is requesting a logout." Gupta col. 13 lines
9 54-55.

10 The server determines if the cookie is valid. If the cookie is valid, the
11 application server may invalidate the current session for the user and send back a
12 notification to the browser that the user has been logged out. If the cookie is not
13 valid, the server may do nothing further or may notify the user that the request
14 cannot be processed. Gupta col. 13 lines 57-64.

15 The server (i.e., login server) may force the user to logout because the time
16 for the current session has expired. For example, if the user connection is
17 terminated prior to logging out (e.g., user modem is turned off). The user is
18 automatically logged out by terminating the session. To logout a user, the
19 application server may check with the login server to see if the user session is still
20 valid. If still valid, the application server may reset the time period for that
21 session. If the session is no longer valid, the application server may destroy the
22 session causing the rejection of further requests from the user (browser). Gupta
23 col 13 line 65 to col. 14 line 10.

24 Claim 1 recites "expiring cookies from the browser in accordance with the
25 request, wherein the cookies include data provided to the browser by the server".

1 The Office presents that "Gupta inherently teaches expiring cookies from
2 the browser by teaching that the cookie (which contains the information regarding
3 whether or not the user is logged in) is forwarded to the application server – by
4 way of a browser – in order to invalidate (that is, to expire) the current session –
5 which inherently requires the cookie to reflect the changed log-in status and
6 thereby expire them".

7 Applicants do not disagree with the Office in that Gupta teaches a cookie is
8 forwarded (sent) from the browser; however, such a cookie is used to identify the
9 user to the application server and login server. The cookie described in Gupta is
10 used to login and/or validate the user by information to server as to who the user is,
11 not to provide information as to whether the user is logged in or not, as the Office
12 contends.

13 There is nothing in Gupta that teaches or shows that the cookie from the
14 browser is ever expired. As discussed, Gupta teaches a cookie that contains user
15 information used to identify the user to the application server and login server. If
16 such a cookie is expired from the browser, there would be no cookie that the
17 browser can send to the login server and "[w]ithout the cookie, the server may not
18 know who is requesting a logout."

19 In performing a logout, Gupta relies on validating the user through the
20 cookie that identifies the user. Therefore if the cookie is expired or retired, there
21 would not be a cookie to send to allow the logout procedure.

22 Accordingly, Gupta does not show every element of claim 1, and the
23 rejection of claim 1 is therefore improper. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully
24 request that the §102 rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.
25

1 Independent claim 7 recites in part "causing a request for data from the
2 server to be issued by the browser, wherein the request causes the server to expire
3 cookies from the browser". As discussed above in support of claim 1, Gupta fails
4 to teach or show cookies that are expired from the browser.

5 Accordingly, Gupta does not show every element of claim 7, and the
6 rejection of claim 7 is therefore improper. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully
7 request that the §102 rejection of claim 7 be withdrawn.

8
9 **35 U.S.C. §103**

10 Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over
11 Gupta.

12 Dependent claim 2 depends from claim 1, and comprises the element
13 "expiring cookies from the browser in accordance with the request, wherein the
14 cookies include data provided to the browser by the server".

15 As discussed above in support of claim 1, Gupta fails to teach expiring
16 cookies from the browser, since doing so would defeat the teachings of Gupta to
17 use a cookie to validate a user to a server. Without the cookie, as taught by Gupta,
18 the user would not be able to perform a logout from the server.

19 The Office maintains that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary
20 skill in art to combine to acknowledge a successful logout as further recited in the
21 element of claim 2 "wherein the request further causes the server to send an image
22 to the browser which is indicative of successful logout". However, since Gupta
23 fails to teach or suggest expiring cookies from the browser, it would not have been
24 obvious to combine Gupta with what the Office maintains as what was obvious to
25 one of ordinary skill in the art.

1 Accordingly, Gupta does not show every element of claim 2, and the
2 rejection of claim 2 is therefore improper. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully
3 request that the §103 rejection of claim 2 be withdrawn.

4
5 Claims 3-6 and 8-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being
6 unpatentable over Gupta in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,774,551 to Wu et al (Wu).

7 Dependent claim 3 depends from claim 1, and therefore comprises the
8 element "expiring cookies from the browser in accordance with the request,
9 wherein the cookies include data provided to the browser by the server".

10 As discussed above in support of claim 1, Gupta fails to teach expiring
11 cookies from the browser, since doing so would defeat the teachings of Gupta to
12 use a cookie to validate a user to a server. Without the cookie, as taught by Gupta,
13 the user would not be able to perform a logout from the server.

14 The Office relies on Wu as teaching "the method wherein multiple servers
15 are logged out by selection of a single logout link". However, Wu provides no
16 assistance in light of Gupta as to the recited method of claim 3. Since Gupta does
17 not teach or suggest "expiring cookies from the browser in accordance with the
18 request, wherein the cookies include data provided to the browser by the server", it
19 would not have been obvious to combine "the method wherein multiple servers are
20 logged out by selection of a single logout link" as taught by Wu.

21 Accordingly, Gupta in view of Wu does not show every element of claim 3
22 and the rejection of claim 3 is therefore improper. Accordingly, Applicants
23 respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claim 3 be withdrawn.

24 Dependent claim 26 depends from claim 24, and therefore comprises the
25 element "providing a link to an expire cookies page on each server in the form of

1 an image source tag that when called causes each server to expire cookies on both
2 the server and user's browser, and to provide an image back to the browser upon
3 succeeding in logging out the user".

4 As discussed above in support of claims 1 and 7, Gupta fails to teach
5 expiring cookies from the user's browser, since doing so would defeat the
6 teachings of Gupta to use a cookie to validate a user to a server. Without the
7 cookie, as taught by Gupta, the user would not be able to perform a logout from
8 the server.

9 The Office relies on Wu as teaching "the method wherein multiple servers
10 are logged out by selection of a single logout link". However, Wu provides no
11 assistance in light of Gupta as to the recited method of claim 26. Since Gupta does
12 not teach or suggest "... expire cookies on ... user's browser", it would not have
13 been obvious to combine "the method wherein multiple servers are logged out by
14 selection of a single logout link" as taught by Wu.

15 Accordingly, Gupta in view of Wu does not show every element of claim 26
16 and the rejection of claim 26 is therefore improper. Accordingly, Applicants
17 respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claim 26 be withdrawn.

18 **Dependent claim 4** depends from claim 1, and therefore comprises the
19 element "expiring cookies from the browser in accordance with the request,
20 wherein the cookies include data provided to the browser by the server".

21 As discussed above in support of claim 1, Gupta fails to teach expiring
22 cookies from the browser, since doing so would defeat the teachings of Gupta to
23 use a cookie to validate a user to a server. Without the cookie, as taught by Gupta,
24 the user would not be able to perform a logout from the server.
25

1 The Office relies on Wu as teaching "the method wherein the logout link
2 may be located on any of the multiple servers and an authentication server".
3 However, Wu provides no assistance in light of Gupta as to the recited method of
4 claim 4. Since Gupta does not teach or suggest "expiring cookies from the
5 browser in accordance with the request, wherein the cookies include data provided
6 to the browser by the server", it would not have been obvious to combine "the
7 method wherein the logout link may be located on any of the multiple servers and
8 an authentication server" as taught by Wu.

9 Accordingly, Gupta in view of Wu does not show every element of claim 4
10 and the rejection of claim 4 is therefore improper. Accordingly, Applicants
11 respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claim 4 be withdrawn.

12 **Dependent claim 5** depends from claim 1, and therefore comprises the
13 element "expiring cookies from the browser in accordance with the request,
14 wherein the cookies include data provided to the browser by the server".

15 As discussed above in support of claim 1, Gupta fails to teach expiring
16 cookies from the browser, since doing so would defeat the teachings of Gupta to
17 use a cookie to validate a user to a server. Without the cookie, as taught by Gupta,
18 the user would not be able to perform a logout from the server.

19 The Office relies on Wu as teaching "the method wherein a visited sites
20 cookie maintains a list of all sites logged into by the user". However, Wu provides
21 no assistance in light of Gupta as to the recited method of claim 5. Since Gupta
22 does not teach or suggest "expiring cookies from the browser in accordance with
23 the request, wherein the cookies include data provided to the browser by the
24 server", it would not have been obvious to combine "the method wherein a visited
25 sites cookie maintains a list of all sites logged into by the user" as taught by Wu.

1 Accordingly, Gupta in view of Wu does not show every element of claim 5
2 and the rejection of claim 5 is therefore improper. Accordingly, Applicants
3 respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claim 5 be withdrawn.

4 Dependent claim 6 depends from claim 1, and therefore comprises the
5 element "expiring cookies from the browser in accordance with the request,
6 wherein the cookies include data provided to the browser by the server".

7 As discussed above in support of claim 1, Gupta fails to teach expiring
8 cookies from the browser, since doing so would defeat the teachings of Gupta to
9 use a cookie to validate a user to a server. Without the cookie, as taught by Gupta,
10 the user would not be able to perform a logout from the server.

11 The Office relies on Wu as teaching "the method wherein selected cookies
12 are expired to log out of the server". However, Wu provides no assistance in light
13 of Gupta as to the recited method of claim 6. Since Gupta does not teach or
14 suggest "expiring cookies from the browser in accordance with the request,
15 wherein the cookies include data provided to the browser by the server", it would
16 not have been obvious to combine "the method wherein selected cookies are
17 expired to log out of the server" as taught by Wu.

18 Accordingly, Gupta in view of Wu does not show every element of claim 6
19 and the rejection of claim 6 is therefore improper. Accordingly, Applicants
20 respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claim 6 be withdrawn.

21 Claims 8-9 are rejected for the same reasons as set forth in the rejection of
22 claims 2-3. Applicants assert the arguments as presented in support of claims 2-3,
23 in support of claims 8-9.
24
25

1 Accordingly, Gupta in view of Wu does not show every element of claims
2 8-9 and the rejection of claims 8-9 is therefore improper. Accordingly, Applicants
3 respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claims 8-9 be withdrawn.

4 Claims 10, 15-18 and 24 are rejected for the same reasons as set forth in
5 the rejection of claims 1-3. Applicants assert the arguments as presented in
6 support of claims 1-3, in support of claims 10, 15-18 and 24.

7 Accordingly, Gupta in view of Wu does not show every element of claims
8 10, 15-18 and 24 and the rejection of claims 10, 15-18 and 24 is therefore
9 improper. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection of
10 claims 10, 15-18 and 24 be withdrawn.

11 Claim 11 is rejected for the same reasons as set forth in the rejection of
12 claims 1-3 and 5. Applicants assert the arguments as presented in support of
13 claims 1-3 and 5, in support of claim 11.

14 Accordingly, Gupta in view of Wu does not show every element of claim 11
15 and the rejection of claim 11 is therefore improper. Accordingly, Applicants
16 respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claim 11 be withdrawn.

17 Claims 12, 13, 22, 23, 25, 28 and 33-40 are rejected for the same reasons
18 as set forth in the rejection of claim 5. Applicants assert the arguments as
19 presented in support of claims 5, in support of claims 12, 13, 22, 23, 25, 28 and 33-
20 40.

21 Accordingly, Gupta in view of Wu does not show every element of claims
22 13, 22, 23, 25, 28 and 33-40 and the rejection of claims 13, 22, 23, 25, 28 and 33-
23 40 is therefore improper. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the
24 §103 rejection of claims 13, 22, 23, 25, 28 and 33-40 be withdrawn.
25

Dependent claims 14 depends from claim 11, and therefore comprises the element "a module that provides a link to an expire cookies page on each server that when called causes each server to expire cookies on the user's browser, and to provide an image back to the browser upon succeeding in logging the user out".

As discussed above in support of claims 1 and 7, Gupta fails to teach expiring cookies on the user's browser, since doing so would defeat the teachings of Gupta to use a cookie to validate a user to a server. Without the cookie, as taught by Gupta, the user would not be able to perform a logout from the server.

The Office maintains that “[a]t the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to allow the request for a logout page to be initiated via more than one server page”. However, this assertion by the Office provides no assistance in light of Gupta as to the recited system of claim 14. Since Gupta does not teach or suggest “to expire cookies on the user’s browser” it would not have been obvious to combine the Office’s assertion.

Accordingly, Gupta in view of the Office's assertion does not show every element of claim 14 and the rejection of claim 14 is therefore improper. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claim 14 be withdrawn.

Dependent claim 27 is rejected for the same reasons as set forth in the rejection of claim 14. Applicants assert the arguments as presented in support of claims 14, in support of claim 27.

Accordingly, Gupta in view of the Office's assertion does not show every element of claim 27 and the rejection of claim 27 is therefore improper. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claim 27 be withdrawn.

1 **Dependent claim 19** depends from claim 18, and therefore comprises the
2 element "retiring cookies identified by responses to the get image requests".

3 As discussed above in support of claims 1 and 7, Gupta fails to retiring
4 cookies, since doing so would defeat the teachings of Gupta to use a cookie to
5 validate a user to a server. Without the cookie, as taught by Gupta, the user would
6 not be able to perform a logout from the server.

7 The Office takes Official Notice "that a checkmark image is a symbol for
8 affirmative, a positive result, or a task complete was well known in the art at the
9 time the invention was made". However, the Official Notice taken provides no
10 assistance in light of Gupta as to the recited method of claim 19. Since Gupta does
11 not teach or suggest "retiring cookies identified by responses to the get image
12 requests" it would not have been obvious to combine the Official Notice taken by
13 the Office.

14 Accordingly, Gupta in view of Official Notice does not show every element
15 of claim 19 and the rejection of claim 19 is therefore improper. Accordingly,
16 Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claim 19 be withdrawn.

17 **Dependent claim 20** depends from claim 18, and therefore comprises the
18 element "retiring cookies identified by responses to the get image requests".

19 As discussed above in support of claims 1 and 7, Gupta fails to retiring
20 cookies, since doing so would defeat the teachings of Gupta to use a cookie to
21 validate a user to a server. Without the cookie, as taught by Gupta, the user would
22 not be able to perform a logout from the server.

23 The Office maintains that "[a]t the time the invention was made, it would
24 have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to ensure that any piece of
25 data downloaded was the most current". However, this assertion by the Office

1 provides no assistance in light of Gupta as to the recited method of claim 20.
2 Since Gupta does not teach or suggest "retiring cookies identified by responses to
3 the get image requests" it would not have been obvious to combine the Office's
4 assertion.

5 Accordingly, Gupta in view of the Office's assertion does not show every
6 element of claim 20 and the rejection of claim 20 is therefore improper.
7 Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claim 20 be
8 withdrawn.

9 Dependent claim 21 depends from claim 18, and therefore comprises the
10 element "retiring cookies identified by responses to the get image requests".

11 As discussed above in support of claims 1 and 7, Gupta fails to retiring
12 cookies, since doing so would defeat the teachings of Gupta to use a cookie to
13 validate a user to a server. Without the cookie, as taught by Gupta, the user would
14 not be able to perform a logout from the server.

15 The Office takes Official Notice "including a query in an image tag in a
16 computer networking environment was well known in the art at the time the
17 invention was made". However, the Official Notice taken provides no assistance
18 in light of Gupta as to the recited method of claim 21. Since Gupta does not teach
19 or suggest "retiring cookies identified by responses to the get image requests" it
20 would not have been obvious to combine the Official Notice taken by the Office.

21 Accordingly, Gupta in view of Official Notice does not show every element
22 of claim 21 and the rejection of claim 21 is therefore improper. Accordingly,
23 Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claim 21 be withdrawn.
24
25

1 **Claims 29-32 are rejected for the same reasons as set forth in the rejection**
2 **of claims 18, 20, and 21. Applicants assert the arguments as presented in support**
3 **of claims 18, 20, and 21, in support of claims 29-32.**

4 Accordingly, Gupta in view of Wu, Office's assertion, and Official notice
5 does not show every element of claims 29-32 and the rejection of claims 29-32 is
6 therefore improper. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the §103
7 rejection of claims 29-32 be withdrawn.

8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CONCLUSION

All pending claims 1-40 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the subject application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned attorney before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 10/21/04By: 

Emmanuel A. Rivera
Reg. No. 45,760
(509) 324-9256 ext. 245